DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 780 HE 030 051

AUTHOR Baldwin, Beatrice
TITLE Linking Instructional Productivity Measures and Fiscal Policy: Accountability in Higher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Administrator Attitudes; Department Heads; Educational Economics; Efficiency; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Utilization; *Faculty Workload; *Financial Policy; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Management by Objectives; Organizational Effectiveness; Performance; Policy Formation; *Productivity; Quality Control; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Strategic Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Southeastern Louisiana University

ABSTRACT

This study examined the efforts of Southeastern Louisiana University, a mid-sized public university, to address demands for accountability and the need to generate and evaluate data linking instructional productivity, academic planning, and fiscal policymaking. The study reports the reactions of university administrators and academic leaders to the accountability framework developed by the university's office of institutional research. Two reporting systems were developed: a faculty workload accountability report and an academic productivity analysis. Reports included normative data from institutions participating in the National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity. Additionally, a university strategic planing process was developed that requires academic units to report on progress toward strategic goals. Administrators generally found the reports were helpful in making resource allocation decisions. Department heads also had positive reactions and made suggestions regarding: (1) page layout of data elements; (2) a desire for normative data from a smaller subset of more comparable institutions; and (3) need to more adequately "credit" departments with external research/public service funds generated by faculty. Attached tables detail how academic productivity measures are used to support data for a budget planning report, and provide a sample faculty workload accountability report. Appended are prototypical planning and budgets documents, and a schedule for a resource allocation review. (CH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 780

Linking Instructional Productivity Measures and Fiscal Policy: Accountability in Higher Education

Dr. Beatrice Baldwin,
Asst. Vice President for Institutional Planning, Research and Policy Analysis
Southeastern Louisiana University
Hammond, LA 70402
bbaldwin@selu.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Beatrice Baldwin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 24 - 28, Chicago, IL.

ME030 051

Linking Instructional Productivity Measures and Fiscal Policy: Accountability in Higher Education

Introduction

Institutions of higher education have been increasingly subject to demands for accountability. National trends, state accountability legislation, and general public perception have pressured colleges and universities to generate and evaluate data that links instructional productivity, academic planning, and fiscal policymaking.

This paper presents the case of a mid-sized public, comprehensive university in Louisiana and its efforts to address accountability demands. The reactions of university administrators and academic leaders to a campus accountability framework developed by the university's office of institutional research are discussed and present a background for recommendations and conclusions that can be extrapolated to other universities.

Background

Accountability pressures on institutions of higher education are emanating from a variety of sources. At the national level, focus on instructional productivity and fiscal management has prompted a national debate on the primary roles of America's colleges and universities. Political leaders, parents, and students have expressed concerns that the high costs of university education are not matched by educational outcomes (Boyer, 1995). Such discussion has resulted in several national initiatives. Prompted by federal Student-Right-to-Know (SRTK) legislation in 1992, the Joint Commission for Accountability Reporting (JCAR) developed recommendations to standardize reporting formats for student progression, graduation rates, costs, and faculty activity (JCAR, 1996).

As another example, in 1998, the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) will begin requiring nationally standardized reporting of student retention and graduation. Colleges and universities across the nation have been put on notice that they can no longer avoid accountability questions.

At the state level, the demands for accountability have resulted in a myriad of legislative acts. By 1995, 20 of the states had initiated some form of accountability mandate to report on faculty activity, including legislation and governing board requirements. These mandates have required institutional reporting ranging from required annual reporting on faculty workload by campus with state funding tied to "standard" loads (Maryland) to governing board requests to develop plans for improving faculty teaching loads (Iowa). A substantial proportion of the other 30 reported that although no specific mandate had been issued, there were increasing

requests for information on academic productivity from government agencies and governing boards (State Higher Education Fiscal Officers, 1994).

In Louisiana in 1993, Act 237 of the state legislature established the State Accountability in Public Higher Education Advisory Committee, outlined thirteen specific performance standards, and directed the Committee to devise a plan for measuring and documenting accountability. In 1995, Act 459 directed the Board of Regents to administer, implement, monitor, and evaluate an ongoing accountability reporting process. The Board's Accountability Steering Committee and several subcommittees have been assigned to study institutional effectiveness, progression and graduation, remedial course offerings, continuing education, and faculty workload among other issues. These groups are developing means to collect data from institutions from across the state for reporting to the state legislature.

At Southeastern Louisiana University, efforts by the office of institutional research to focus on and comprehensively address instructional accountability were linked to a university-wide strategic planning and budgeting initiative. In addition, careful consideration was given to how the institution might address national and state issues. After garnering the support of top-level university administrators, a faculty workload accountability report and an academic productivity reporting system were designed. Reports at the department, college, and institutional level were distributed to department chairs, deans, and the provost respectively. Both reports were used for data-based decision-making and for providing evidence for resource requests at annual university budget hearings.

Faculty Workload Accountability Reporting

Each semester, department heads are required to input course schedule information for the upcoming semester. Input includes the course title and section, the course load in credit hours, the budget unit paying for the instruction, and the faculty member assigned. By matching data from the personnel database system and the student registration system, the report calculates the SCHs produced by each faculty member as well as the instructional load.

In addition, reassigned time is reported for each faculty member. Such reassigned time includes buy-outs for funded grants and contracts, internally-funded research, academic support such as laboratory supervision, and administrative reassignment. Summary information by department gives instructional and non-instructional totals, the number of hours being taught as overload or by adjunct faculty, and average load hours by faculty type.

Academic Productivity Analysis

The university's academic productivity analysis was based in part on data analysis necessary for voluntary participation in the National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity. Begun in 1993, the National Study is currently funded by the

Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), is directed by the University of Delaware's Office of Institutional Research, and involves over 300 participating institutions, including research, doctoral, comprehensive, and baccalaureate colleges (Middaugh, 1996). Basic departmental data on teaching workloads, instructional costs, and sponsored research/service productivity is submitted to the National Study by each participating institution, and each university then receives an aggregate report outlining average workloads, costs, and productivity measures by university type and discipline.

Building upon these data, the office of institutional research designed a reporting ratio format for on-campus use that included FTE students taught/FTE faculty, students enrolled/FTE faculty, SCH's/FTE faculty, class sections/FTE faculty, and average class size by department. Longitudinal data on number of degrees granted, number of majors, total student enrollment, SCH's generated, and number of FTE faculty permit departments to look at the effects of program planning over time.

Department chairs and university administrators also receive measures of direct instructional cost and funds generated by instruction and external sources. Data elements are extracted from the university's administrative information systems and databases.

In addition to these departmental data, the University can also receive workload, cost and productivity data from peer institutions participating the National Study. Providing normative data could allow departments to gain external perspective on resource allocation decisions, such as the productivity impact of increasing average class size or reassigning faculty to externally-funded projects.

University Strategic Planning and Budgeting

University strategic planning processes require each academic unit to annually report on progress toward strategic goals. Furthermore, university budget hearings required units to prioritize requested budget increases in personnel, equipment, and maintenance and to provide rationales for increases above a standstill budget.

Both the faculty workload accountability report and the academic productivity analysis give budget unit heads and members of the budget hearing committee objective data for examining staffing, productivity, and funding patterns which can be factored into resource need prioritization and allocation.

Results and Conclusions

University personnel received their academic productivity report data with their annual budget and planning documents in Fall 1996. The units receive their faculty workload accountability reports each semester. Academic units were required to use data-based evidence in making budget requests for new faculty and instructional resources.

In general, budget unit heads and University budget hearing committee members indicated that the reports were helpful in making resource allocation decisions. Particularly enthusiastic were department heads who were able to make strong cases for new faculty additions based on information such as average class sizes and normative data from other institutions.

Suggestions from department heads focused on three issues: 1) improving page layout of data elements for increased utility and comparability; 2) desire to have normative data from a smaller subset of more comparable peer institutions as opposed to current situation in which normative data comes from all participating National Study institutions within the same Carnegie classification; and 3) inability of current administrative information system to adequately "credit" instructional units with all external research/public service funds generated by faculty activity. All three issues are being addressed for Fall 1997.

University administrators reported that the analysis provide them with needed comparable information for budget hearings as well as for making other ad hoc resource allocation issues during the fiscal year. In several instances, administrators were able to utilize the analysis to answer Board of Regents inquiries. Collection of data for state accountability efforts will be facilitated by the analysis. The report also helped to provide institutional perspective on addressing SRTK issues.

Implications

- Educate faculty and administrators on the importance of accountability reporting
- Share reporting format and allow end-users input into format choices
- Make reports multi-purpose to reduce monitoring connotation
- Combine accountability with empowerment
- Provide more meaningful comparative data from recognized peer institutions
- Ensure that reporting format and usage validates institutional mission and strategic plan
- Aim for faculty workload systems that meaningfully account for teaching, research, and service work

SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY

Academic Productivity Measures: A Budget Planning Report for Instructional Units

	Department of Management					College of Business				
	Fall 1993	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	% Change 1993-96	Fall 1993	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	% Change 1993-96
I. Total Course Enrollment										
Lower Division (100,200)	771	749	835	759	-1.6%	2821	2852	3134	3257	15.5%
Upper Divsion (300, 400)	1160	1146	1196	1223	5.4%	2957	3011	3073	3066	3.7%
Graduate (500 or greater)	92	110	114	106	15.2%	273	238	284	303	11.0%
Total	2023	2005	2145	2088	3.2%	6051	6101	6491	6626	9.5%
II. Total Number of Sections Taught										
Lower Division (100,200)	20	19	18	19	-5.0%	79	82	83	83	5.1%
Upper Division (300, 400)	29	32	34	35	20.7%	88	88	95	100	13.6%
Graduate (500 or greater)	4	5	5	5	25.0%	13	12	15	17	30.8%
Total	53	56	57	59	11.3%	180	182	193	200	11.1%
III. Average Class Size										
Lower Division (100,200)	38.55	39.42	46.39	39.95	3.6%	35.71	34.78	37.76	39.24	9.9%
Upper Division (300, 400)	40.01	35.81	35.18	34.94	-12.6%	33.60	34.22	32.35	30.66	-8.8%
Graduate Lecture (500 or greater)	23.00	22.00	22.80	21.20	-7.8%	21.00	19.83	18.93	17.82	-15.1%
Graduate Individualized	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.1	-4.3%	2.8	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.6%
Total	38.17	35.80	37.63	35.39	-7.3%	33.62	33.52	33.63	33.13	-1.4%
IV. Student Credit Hours Generated										
Lower Division (100,200)	1233	1284	1292	1368	10.9%	4750	4878	4958	5199	9.5%
Upper Division (300, 400)	4431	4311	4418	4584	3.5%	12279	12483	12956	13104	6.7%
Graduate (500 or greater)	405	420	455	483	19.3%	1110	945	1021	1170	5.4%
Total	6069	6015	6165	6435	6.0%	18139	18303	18658	19473	7.4%
V. Number of FTE Students Taught										
Undergraduate (Total SCHs/12)	472	466	487	496	5.1%	1420	1447	1479	1525	7.4%
Graduate (Total SCHs/9)	41	47	51	54	31.7%	123	105	124	130	5.4%
Total	513	513	538	550	7.3%	1543	1552	1598	1655	7.3%
VI. Number of FTE Majors										
Undergraduate (SCHs of Majors/12)	735	677	689	703	-4.3%	2233	2192	2201	2247	0.6%
Graduate (SCHs of Majors/9)	119	108	125	132	11.2%	120	108	115	133	10.1%
Total	854	785	797	835	-2.1%	2354	2300	2358	2380	1.1%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY
Academic Productivity Measures: A Budget Planning Report for Instructional Units

	Department of Management					College of Business				
	Fall 1993	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	% Change 1993-96	Fall 1993	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	% Change 1993-96
VII. Number of Degrees Granted										
Undergraduate	40	43	45	-	12.5%	141	134	136	-	-3.5%
Graduate	23	23	24	-	4.3%	23	23	25	-	8.7%
Total	63	66	69	-	9.5%	164	157	156	-	-4.9%
VIII. Number of FTE Faculty										
Number of Unfilled Positions	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.0%	0.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.0%
Full-time Faculty	16.00	15.00	16.00	17.00	6.3%	49.00	51.00	51.00	52.00	6.1%
Part-time Faculty	1.25	1.50	1.25	1.25	0.0%	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.75	0.0%
Full-time Unclassified Staff	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.0%
Part-time Unclassified Staff	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Graduate Assistants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Total	17.25	17.50	17.25	18.25	5.8%	56.75	59.00	59.75	59.75	5.3%
IX. Percent of SCH's Taught by										
Full-time Faculty	92.4%	88.6%	89.7%	91.6%	-.8%	88.4%	87.1%	87.9%	88.2%	-0.2%
Part-time Faculty	7.6%	9.9%	10.4%	8.4%	.6%	9.4%	11.0%	10.4%	9.6%	.2%
Full-time Unclassified Staff	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	1.9%	2.1%	2.2%	0.0%
Part-time Unclassified Staff	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Graduate Assistants	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
X. Workload Ratios										
FTE Students Taught/FTE Faculty	29.7	29.3	30.5	31.9	7.3%	27.2	26.3	27.2	27.7	1.8%
Students Enrolled/FTE Faculty	117.3	114.6	120.3	124.3	6.0%	106.6	103.4	104.5	108.6	1.9%
SCHs/FTE Faculty	351.8	343.7	356.9	373.0	6.0%	319.6	310.2	319.6	325.9	2.0%
Number of Sections /FTE Faculty	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.3	7.5%	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.2	0.0%

SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY
Academic Productivity Measures: A Budget Planning Report for Instructional Units

	Department of Management				College of Business			
	AY 1993-1994	AY 1994-1995	AY 1995-1996	% Change	AY 1993-1994	AY 1994-1995	AY 1995-1996	% Change
XI. Cost of Instruction & Cost Ratios								
Direct Instructional Cost	1177345	1089230	1146709	-2.60%	3431422	3537549	3679052	7.22%
Direct Instructional Cost/FTE Major	766	771	799	4.31%	809	854	857	5.93%
Direct Instructional Cost/SCH	108	101	103	-4.63%	105	110	110	4.76%
Direct Instructional Cost/FTE Students	1313	1181	1185	-9.75%	1308	1267	1308	0.00%
XII. Revenue Measures & Ratios								
Tuition Revenue from Majors	2484776	2298386	2372527	-4.52%	6849704	6737377	7096221	3.60%
Earned Income from Instruction	1471681	1467600	1528945	3.89%	4398608	4341667	4627204	5.20%
Sponsored Research	0	0	0	0.00%	42683	43414	73241	71.59%
Sponsored Public Service	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0.00%
Total Sponsored Income	0	0	0	0.00%	42683	43414	73241	71.59%
Earned Income+Sponsored Income	1471681	1467600	1528945	3.89%	4441291	4385081	4700445	5.84%
Earned Income /Direct Instructional Cost	1.25	1.34	1.33	-	1.28	1.23	1.28	
Sponsored Income/FTE Faculty	0	0	0	0.00%	752	735	1226	63.03%
Earned+Sponsored Income/FTE Faculty	85315	83863	88634	3.89%	78260	74323	78669	0.52%

Faculty Workload Accountability Report -- Southeastern Louisiana University
Fall 1996 Date: 08/25/96

College: Business Dept: Management (1132)

FACULTY NAME & APPT*	XFR GRP	ASSIGNMENT	FNC	COURSE	CR HRS	LOAD HRS	TOT STU	SCH	BUD UNT	COMMENTS
Jensen, Daniel G.		Management Sci Seminar	IN	MGMT 662-01 (1765)	3	0.0	3	9	1132	NC IS
493-72-4239		Production Mgmt	IN	MGMT 474-02 (1705)	3	3.0	31	93	1132	
FF09 FA FP TN		Production Mgmt	IN	MGMT 474-03 (1706)	3	3.0	32	96	1132	T1
		Production Mgmt	IN	MGMT 474-04 (1707)	3	3.0	33	99	1132	
						9.0	99	297		
Omar, Abdul M.		Business Statistics	IN	MGMT 261x-06 (1669)	3	3.0	41	123	1132	OC
435-98-7943		Business Statistics Lab	IN	MGMT 262-01 (1867)	1	1.0	80	80	1132	OL LB
FF09 FA AP TN	314	Management Science	IN	MGMT 362-02 (1686)	3	3.0	45	135	1132	
	314	Management Science	IN	MGMT 562-02 (1699)	3	0.0	10	30	1132	
		LEQSF Grant	GR		-	3.0	0	0	3265	
						10.0	176	368		
Cappel, Linda		Advertising	IN	MRKT 342-01 (1492)	3	3.0	47	141	1156	OD
403-76-9241		Reassigned Time-Dept Head	DH		-	6.0	0	0	1132	
FF12 DH FP TN						9.0	47	141		
Sterling, Ken		Advertising	IN	MRKT 342-02 (1493)	3	3.0	42	126	1156	OD
147-42-5267		Business Law	IN	MGMT 232-01 (1660)	3	1.5	40	60	1132	TT
FF09 FA IN NT		Reassigned Time-Fresh. Adv	AS		-	6.0	0	0	1568	
						10.5	82	186		
Wessinger, Patricia		Intro to Production	IN	MGMT 311-04 (1725)	3	3.0	52	156	1132	
258-95-8765						3.0	52	156		
FF04 FA IN NT										
Kilroy, Leroy		Mngt Lab	IN	MGMT 112-01 (1525)	1	1.0	25	25	1132	LB
589-58-5888		Business Law	IN	MGMT 232-01 (1660)	3	1.5	40	60	1132	TT
UF12 DR OU NT						2.5	65	85		

Faculty Workload Accountability Report -- Southeastern Louisiana University
Fall 1996 Date: 08/25/96

College: Business Dept: Management (1132)

	HRS	TOT STU	SCH
Department Totals			
Instruction	35.0	521	1233
Noninstructional	15.0		
	50.0		
Compensated	29.0		
Non Comp-Group	3.0		
Non Comp-Other	3.0		
	35.0		
Grant	3.0		
Research	0.0		
Admin	0.0		
Acad Support	6.0		
Service	0.0		
Dept Head	6.0		
Dean	0.0		
Teaching	0.0		
	15.0		
Part-Time	3.0		
Overload	1.0		
Off Campus	3.0		
Lab	2.0		
Out of Dept	6.0	89	267
Term 1	3.0		
Team Taught	3.0		
Independent Stu	3.0		

Faculty Type	AvgHr	Count
Faculty, FullTime, 9mo	10.2	3
Faculty, FullTime, 12mo	9.0	1
Faculty, PartTime, 4.5mo	3.0	1
Unclass, FullTime, 12mo	2.5	1

Unit/Department Strategic Plan 1996-2001

Unit Name: Dept. of Existentialism **Unit Head: J. P. Sartre**
Date Submitted: Oct. 21, 1996

University Strategic Objectives	Unit Strategic Objectives
Goal 1, Obj. 1: develop technology-enhanced undergraduate...academic programs that will foster learning linked with the workplace Goal 1, Obj. 2: encourage experimentation with and development of innovative curricula, courses, and delivery systems Goal 2, Obj. 4: develop "course on demand" open-access, open-entry curricula...	1. By the year 2000-2001, Dept. will integrate technology, particularly multi-media and Internet, into every course offered. 2. By the year 2000-2001, at least 2 courses will feature workplace-based, interactive technology delivery systems.
Goal 1, Obj. 2: devise a program to enhance effective teaching and assessment...	3. By the year 2000-2001, the Dept. will have an established program for maintaining and measuring effective teaching and assessment.
Goal 1, Obj. 5: provide services for students in the seven areas of wellness	4. By the year 2000-2001, the Dept. will have an established program of extracurricular activities for EXST majors
Goal 2, Obj. 3: review existing programs with the intent of updating courses and curricula	5. By the year 2000-2001, all EXST curricula will show evidence of updating, and the number of hours required will have been reduced by at least 10%
Goal 3, Obj. 1: create awareness of multicultural issues and to increase communication	6. By the year 2000-2001, all EXST courses will incorporate needed multicultural and global components
Goal 5, Obj. 3: increase systematically the funds generated by external grants and contracts	7. By the year 2000-2001, the Dept. will have increased the value of grants and contracts received by at least 50%
Goal 6, Obj. 3: provide professional development opportunities for University employees	8. By the year 2000-2001, all classified staff in the Dept. will have engaged in professional development activities that will upgrade business and technological skills
Goal 7, Obj. 1: increase the percentage of well-prepared students entering Southeastern...	9. By the year 2000-2001, the Dept. will have a comprehensive program to recruit and retain academically able students.
Goal 7, Obj. 3: to implement a comprehensive review of [programs to identify problems...	10. By the year 2000-2001, problems in retention, progression, and graduation in EXST programs will have been identified and eliminated.
Goal 8, Obj. 1: design and implement appropriate technology-rich instruction...	11. By the year 2000-2001, all EXST faculty will have the appropriate technology skills for instruction. 12. By the year 2000-2001, the Dept. will have the instructional technology appropriate for multi-media and Internet instruction.
Goal 10, Obj. 1: make modern electronic communication... a standard	13. By the year 2000-2001, electronic communication will be the norm for dept. business.

Unit/Department Annual Plan, 1996-1997 / 1997-1998

Unit Name: Dept. of Existentialism Unit Head: J. P. Sartre
Date Submitted: Oct. 21, 1996

Unit Strategic Objective	Action to be Taken 1996 - 1997 into 1997 - 1998	Performance Indicator
1 & 2	a. Review courses and identify where technology can be integrated appropriately. b. Two courses will be identified.	a. 100% of courses will have been reviewed and proposals made for technology inclusion. b. Preliminary plans will have been outlined.
3	c. A departmental committee will be formed to make recommendations. MFA results will be incorporated.	c. Action plan of committee will have been reviewed by department.
4	d. Faculty will work with the EXST majors club to discuss possibilities.	d. Action plan will have been completed.
5	e. The dept. curriculum committee will begin review of curricula.	e. A report outlining needs will be reviewed by the dept.
6	f. The dept. curriculum committee will begin review of curricula.	f. A report outlining needs will be reviewed by the dept.
7	g. The dept. head will work with faculty to encourage and identify grant/contract activity.	g. The value of external proposals will have increased by at least 20%.
8	h. Classified staff will begin individualized annual professional development planning.	h. Dept. heads will have documented all plans and results.
9	i. The dept. will form an ad hoc task force with high GPA majors and faculty to investigate issues.	i. A preliminary set of recommendations will have been prepared.
10	j. The dept. will gather information regarding retention, progression, and graduation of majors.	j. A set of conclusions will be reviewed by the dept.
11 & 12	k. All faculty members will self-identify desired technology skills as part of performance planning. l. The Dept. will plan for systematic upgrade/purchase of current hardware and software.	j. 100% of performance plans will reflect professional development in instructional technology. l. A plan will be on file, and funding will be outlined.
13	m. The Dept. will set standards for dept. communication.	m. Standards will be distributed to faculty and staff.

Requests for Additional Budget Expenditures, 1997-1998

Unit Name: Dept. of Existentialism Unit Head: J. P. Sartre
Date Submitted: Oct. 21, 1996

Description	Rationale	Estimated Cost
<u>Personnel</u> Asst. Professor with state-of-the-art technology knowledge and skills	Necessary to meet dept. strategic objectives 1, 2, 11, 12, 13; to decrease average 65 students/faculty ratio in lower level UG courses as required by accreditation; to strengthen MFA technology objective; to meet technology standard for EXST accreditation agency	$40,000 + benefits
<u>Equipment</u> 3 portable classroom multi-media systems, including CD-ROM, projection capability, and networking capability	Necessary to meet dept. strategic objectives 1, 11, 12	$11, 000 (total cost = $22,000; 50% of cost will be paid from dept. academic enhancement)
<u>Maintenance</u>		

Resource Allocation Review Priorities:
Criteria for Evaluating Requests for Additional Budget Expenditures

CRITERIA	DEFINITION	PRIORITY
University Strategic Plan	Requested resource is directly tied to meeting a university strategic objective and its related unit objective	1
External Mandate	Requested resource is necessary to meet the requirements of an external agency, such as SACS, a specialty accreditation association, or a governing board	2
Positive Student/ Client Impact	Requested resource will have an exceptionally positive teaching or service impact on students, faculty, or staff	3
Cost Effectiveness	Requested resource will eventually result in cost savings and/or increase in revenues to the unit	4
Unit Strategic Plan	Requested resource is directly tied to meeting a strategic objective of the unit; however, it does not meet a university strategic objective	5
Facilities Maintenance	Requested resource is necessary for maintaining current level of service or function; must be supported by evidence of growth, function increase, and/or unforeseen change in facilities	6
Additional Considerations	Requested resource is necessary and/or desirable for reasons other than the standard criteria above	7